1. VP-internal subject hypothesis

1.1 Definitions

former assumption: subjects are Specifiers of IP and remain in-situ, except in interrogative movement

in-situ: a constituent remains “in place” and does not undergo movement

VP-internal subject hypothesis: subjects originate as Specifiers of VPs and are raised to Spec-position of IPs via subject raising (cf. Radford, 1997)

2. Evidence from expletives

(1) a. There is a horse jumping the fence
   IP
   there  is a  horse jumping the fence
   → there is in Spec position of IP

   evidence: aux can be moved to the front to Comp position
   (1) b. Is there a horse jumping the fence?
   CP
   is there a horse jumping the fence

- aux selects VP as complements:
- IP head is determines morphological form of VP head
- internal VP structure:

3. Dual role of subjects

a horse    jumping    the fence
   DP
   VP
   V
   a horse
   →
   A horse is jumping the fence

→ a horse can be in spec-VP and in spec-IP
- subject originates in spec-VP in expletive structures (there is…) and is raised to spec-IP in non-expletive structures

4. Evidence from cliticization

(2) a. I want to travel to Spain
   →
   b. I wanna travel to Spain
   c. Who do you want to travel to Spain?
   →
   d. *Who do you wanna travel to Spain?

5. Grammaticality in OT

The most harmonic output with respect to a set of ranked constraints is by definition considered grammatical

5.1 Ungrammaticality problem

Why do some grammatical constructions never occur? proposed solution: under some constraint rankings the optimal candidate does not realize any info from INPUT, called null-parse effect: language has ungrammatical construction but it is silent

5.2 Null parse and parsing constraints

Grimshaw: competing candidates must have in common
- a lexical head and its argument structure
- equivalent semantics (e.g. tense features etc.)

5.2.1 Underparsing: lexical items {I, see, Bill}

(3) a. I see Bill
   b. I see
   → underparsing of contentful elements is blocked

5.2.2 Equivalence: lexical items {Mary, kick, bucket, die}

(4) a. Mary kicked the bucket
   b. Mary died

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT with feature F</th>
<th>Constraint X</th>
<th>PARSE-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate C</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (null parse)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 12: Parse-constraint

low ranking of Parse constraint: null parse (= unstructured string of items) is optimal

6. Passives

passive: external 0-role of V is no longer available for subject position
   → S-position is non-thematic

EPP (weak version): At s-structure, spec-IP must be overtly filled with a DP inherently predicative categories like VP must have a subject
   → structure is saved from violating EPP by inserting an expletive
correct if expletive has referential associate

(1) a. There is a horse jumping the fence

not correct if expletive does not have it

(5) Es wurde getanzt

→ argument that impersonal passives are subjectless sentences
→ German: expletive appears to preserve V2 constraint

EPP has role in passive formation: requires raising
raising is movement, thus another constraint necessary for passive:

STAY (Grimshaw) = Do not move

explanation of ungrammaticality requires PARSE-passive constraint
PARSE-passive = parse passive morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>passive transitive</th>
<th>EPP</th>
<th>PARSE-passive</th>
<th>STAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP, V-pass t.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-pass DP</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (null parse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 13: Optimal output for transitive passives

→ English has passives of transitives

(6) The house was painted yesterday

but no passives of intransitives

(7) *There was danced yesterday